



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARK
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

09/214848

1/17/99

Sekine

01208/PS02

EXAMINER

Choi

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1616

14

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Frank Choi (3) Lee Chang
(2) John Pak (4) _____

Date of Interview 7/27/02

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Televideo Conference ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: _____

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: US 4690915, US 4006656, 5443983

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Examiner suggested that method of treating EBV with limitation that the lymphocyte is activated against EBV. Applicant suggests presenting articles showing that most of ordinos still in the past would not expect that autologous lymphocytes would be effective against viral diseases. Examiner indicated that would consider in continuation of evidence.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

[Handwritten signature]

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, Section 713.04 Substance of Interview must Be Made of Record

Except as otherwise provided, a complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application, whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

§1.133 Interviews

(b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111 and 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

§ 1.2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete a two-sheet carbon interleaf Interview Summary Form for each interview held after January 1, 1978 where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks in neat handwritten form using a ball point pen. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, or resulting in an examiner's amendment that fully sets forth the agreement are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate paper number, placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" list on the file wrapper. In a personal interview, the duplicate copy of the Form is removed and given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephonic interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number of the application
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (personal or telephonic)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the claims discussed
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). (Agreements as to allowability are tentative and do not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.)
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview
- Names of other Patent and Trademark Office personnel present.

The Form also contains a statement reminding the applicant of his responsibility to record the substance of the interview.

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his obligation to record the substance of the interview in each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check a box at the bottom of the Form informing the applicant that he need not supplement the Form by submitting a separate record of the substance of the interview.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview:

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner. The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner,
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete or accurate, the examiner will give the applicant one month from the date of the notifying letter to complete the reply and thereby avoid abandonment of the application (37 CFR 1.135(c)).

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any argument or statement attributed to the examiner during the interview. If there is an inaccuracy and it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth his or her version of the statement attributed to him. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication "Interview record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.



Research
Databases

[New Search](#) | [View Folder](#) | [Preferences](#) | [Help](#)

Sign In to My EBSCOhost

Basic
Search

Advanced
Search

Choose
Databases

US PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Keyword

Subjects

Publications

Indexes

Images

References

◀ 30 of 35 ▶ [Result List](#) | [Refine Search](#) | [Print](#) | [E-mail](#)

[Save](#) | [Add to folder](#)

[Folder is empty.](#)

Formats: [Citation](#) | [HTML Full Text](#)

Title: EPSTEIN-BARR VIRUS , By: Henderson, Alan D., Gene Therapy Weekly, 10782842, 6/17/96
Database: Academic Search Premier

Section: JOURNAL ARTICLE SUMMARIES REPORT

EPSTEIN-BARR VIRUS

Heslop, H.E.; Ng, C.Y.C.; Li, C.F.; Smith, C.A.; Loftin, S.K.; Krance, R.A.; Brenner, M.K.; Rooney, C.M.
"Long-Term Restoration of Immunity Against Epstein-Barr Virus Infection by Adoptive Transfer of Gene-Modified Virus-Specific T Lymphocytes." Nature Medicine, May 1996;2(5):551-555.

According to the authors' abstract of an article published in Nature Medicine, "Adoptive transfer of antigen-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTLs) offers safe and effective therapy for certain viral infections and could prove useful in the eradication of tumor cells. Whether or not the infused T cells persist for extended periods, retaining their ability to expand in response to antigenic stimulation, is not known. We now report long-term detection of gene-marked Epstein-Barr virus (EBV)-specific CTLs in immunocompromised patients at risk for the development of EBV lymphoproliferative disease. Infusions of CTLs not only restored cellular immune responses against EBV, but also established populations of CTL precursors that could respond to in vivo or ex vivo challenge with the virus for as long as 18 months. Our findings support wider use of antigen-specific CTLs in adoptive immunotherapy." The corresponding author for this study is: HE Heslop, St Jude Childrens Hosp, Div Bone Marrow Transplantat, 332 N Lauderdale St, Memphis, TN 38105 USA. For subscription information for this journal contact the publisher: Nature Publishing Co, 345 Park Ave South, New York, NY 10010-1707.

~~~~~

Compiled by Alan D. Henderson

---

Copyright of **Gene Therapy Weekly** is the property of NewsRx and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.





**Source:** Gene Therapy Weekly, 6/17/96, p23, 1p

**Item:** 9606231561

[Top of Page](#)

---

Formats: [Citation](#) | [HTML Full Text](#)

◀ 30 of 35 ▶ [Result List](#) | [Refine Search](#)  [Print](#)  [E-mail](#)  
 [Save](#)  [Add to folder](#)

 [Folder is empty.](#)

© 2003 EBSCO Publishing. [Privacy Policy](#) - [Terms of Use](#)

**Record: 1**

**Title:** Epstein-Barr virus.  
**Author(s):** Henderson, Alan D.  
**Source:** Gene Therapy Weekly; 6/17/96, p23, 1/3p  
**Document Type:** Abstract  
**Subject(s):** EPSTEIN-Barr virus  
T cells  
**Abstract:** Presents an abstract of the article 'Long-Term Restoration of Immunity Against Epstein-Barr Virus Infection by Adoptive Transfer of Gene-Modified Virus-Specific T Lymphocytes,' by H. E. Heslop, C. Y. C. Ng et al, published in the May 1996 edition of the periodical 'Nature Medicine.'  
**Full Text Word Count:** 235  
**ISSN:** 10782842  
**Accession Number:** 9606231561  
**Database:** Academic Search Premier

**Section:** JOURNAL ARTICLE SUMMARIES REPORT

**EPSTEIN-BARR VIRUS**

Heslop, H.E.; Ng, C.Y.C.; Li, C.F.; Smith, C.A.; Loftin, S.K.; Krance, R.A.; Brenner, M.K.; Rooney, C.M.  
"Long-Term Restoration of Immunity Against Epstein-Barr Virus Infection by Adoptive Transfer of Gene-Modified Virus-Specific T Lymphocytes." Nature Medicine, May 1996;2(5):551-555.

According to the authors' abstract of an article published in Nature Medicine, "Adoptive transfer of antigen-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes (CTLs) offers safe and effective therapy for certain viral infections and could prove useful in the eradication of tumor cells. Whether or not the infused T cells persist for extended periods, retaining their ability to expand in response to antigenic stimulation, is not known. We now report long-term detection of gene-marked Epstein-Barr virus (EBV)-specific CTLs in immunocompromised patients at risk for the development of EBV lymphoproliferative disease. Infusions of CTLs not only restored cellular immune responses against EBV, but also established populations of CTL precursors that could respond to in vivo or ex vivo challenge with the virus for as long as 18 months. Our findings support wider use of antigen-specific CTLs in adoptive immunotherapy." The corresponding author for this study is: HE Heslop, St Jude Childrens Hosp, Div Bone Marrow Transplantat, 332 N Lauderdale St, Memphis, TN 38105 USA. For subscription information for this journal contact the publisher: Nature Publishing Co, 345 Park Ave South, New York, NY 10010-1707.

~~~~~

Compiled by Alan D. Henderson

Copyright of **Gene Therapy Weekly** is the property of NewsRx and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

Source: Gene Therapy Weekly, 6/17/96, p23, 1p
Item: 9606231561

